

Date: Fri, 30 Apr 93 17:34:43 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #122  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 30 Apr 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 122

Today's Topics:

    Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can! (4 msgs)  
        FCC Rules on Transmission  
    Isn't CB the perfect experimenter's band? (2 msgs)  
    MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS) (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Fri, 30 Apr 1993 11:04:20 GMT  
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!dsinc!gvls1!ean@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr30.045836.18412@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com  
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>  
>  
> 3. As defined within our rules, scanning receivers, or "scanners,"  
> are radio receivers that can automatically switch between four  
> or more frequencies anywhere within the 30-960 MHz band. In...  
>

Does this mean that I can disable 7 channels of my 10 channel scanner  
and then use it to monitor the 'restricted frequencies'?

Just wondering.

--

Ed Naratil

Amateur Packet: w3bnr@N3LA.#epa.PA.USA.NA

(All standard disclaimers apply)

ean@VFL.Paramax.COM

-----  
Date: Fri, 30 Apr 1993 13:17:39 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!

zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!dsinc!gvls1!rossi@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr30.045836.18412@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>strnlgth@netcom.com (David Sternlight) writes:

>

>

>>Unless I'm misreading, the FCC rule has a loophole big enough to drive a  
>>truck through (o.k., a scanner whose lower end starts at 29MHz).

>

>You are misreading. The rule says:

>

> 3. As defined within our rules, scanning receivers, or "scanners,"  
> are radio receivers that can automatically switch between four  
> or more frequencies anywhere within the 30-960 MHz band. In...

>

>So if your radio can automatically switch between four channels within the  
>range of 30-960 MHz it's considered a scanner. The above wording certainly  
>doesn't state or imply that switching between frequencies outside the range  
>in addition to 4 frequencies within the range excludes it from the  
>definition of scanner.

Are you trying to say that a receiver that switches between 4 or more channels  
between, lets say, 25-1200 MHz is \*not\* a "scanner" by the definition above?

=====  
Pete Rossi - WA3NNA                      rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM

Paramax Systems Corporation - a Unisys Company  
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania

=====

-----  
Date: Fri, 30 Apr 1993 18:43:06 GMT

From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM (Pete Rossi) writes:

>In article <1993Apr30.045836.18412@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com  
(nuts2u::little) >>strnlght@netcom.com (David Sternlight) writes:

>...

>

>Are you trying to say that a receiver that switches between 4 or more channels  
>between, lets say, 25-1200 MHz is \*not\* a "scanner" by the definition above?

That was what I thought the original poster was suggesting and I was disagreeing, i.e. I would say it definitely *is* a scanner. It *does* automatically scan 4 or more frequencies between 30-960 MHz so it qualifies. The fact that it does more than the definition says can hardly disqualify it as a scanner. If the wording had been:

3. As defined within our rules, scanning receivers, or "scanners," are radio receivers that can automatically switch between four or more frequencies only within the 30-960 MHz band. In...

or some such thing like that, then it might throw the 25-1300 MHz scanner into question. Another way to look at this is that regulations that apply to people also apply to me even though I'm also an amateur.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: 30 Apr 1993 13:57:36 GMT  
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em While you can!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> 3. As defined within our rules, scanning receivers, or "scanners,"  
> are radio receivers that can automatically switch between four  
> or more frequencies anywhere within the 30-960 MHz band. In...

So, you can have a radio for cellular as long as it only has three memories, or an infinite number of memories as long as they are manually switched.

Sigh, more stinking bull from the cellular industry about the susceptibility of cellular radios to interception. The party line was that handoffs would make it difficult to track the conversations. This however, is untrue in practice. Most conversations sit on a single channel pair for their entire duration.

I'm still waiting for the

# ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS HEALTH ACT

Where it becomes illegal for a user of a cellular telephone to get cancer or other disease from the use of a cellular telephone...

[ Well it worked for the security problem :-) ]

-Ron

-----  
Date: Fri, 30 Apr 93 23:00:58 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: FCC Rules on Transmission  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <95338@hydra.gatech.EDU> gt0701b@prism.gatech.EDU (Jim Hancock) writes:  
>A ham buddy of mine told me that if operating on simplex as  
>long as you are transmitting under 1W that anyone, licensed or not,  
>can talk on these frequencies and even if you are licensed, do not  
>have to identify.  
>  
>Does anybody know if this is true and what is the rule?

This is not true. You *must* have a valid amateur license to transmit on amateur frequencies. Even then, different classes of license authorize operation on larger and smaller bands of frequencies.

I believe a licensed amateur may operate a remote-control transmitter in a model craft at power levels not to exceed 1W without regularly identifying, but a license is still required.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: 30 Apr 93 11:30:30 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
newsserver.jvnc.net!netnews.upenn.edu!priajat!triangle.cs.uofs.edu!



>--

> Jeff Jones AB6MB | OPPOSE THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT!

^^^^^^--- if you like this.

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc. Amateur Radio Callsign KZ10  
Project Leader, Recognition products kz1o@n0ary.#noca.ca.na  
Internet: dbushong@wang.com

-----  
Date: Fri, 30 Apr 1993 14:51:41 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!ra!cs.umd.edu!afterlife!  
blackbird.afit.af.mil!blackbird!jmill@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1rp18t\$19p@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

jerryb@jerber.sandiego.sgi.com (Jerry Bransford) writes:  
>Right on!! To those who CAN'T STAND not knowing all the CAP/MARS, etc  
>frequencies, CTCSS tones, etc. etc. GET A LIFE!!

Oh, those frequencies aren't secret - they're in just about every  
scanner book and magazine, so it's not like it's hard to find them.

What I think is hilarious is that the people in those services think  
their frequencies ARE secret. Perhaps that's part of the thrill.

Golly, I hope I didn't just ruin it for them. Sorry, dude.  
- Brian

But that's not the point. The main reason for not having people give out  
the frequency on the air is to get them used to the idea that certain  
information is to never go out on the air. OPSEC. 'nuff said.

Jeff

--

Jeff Miller, NH6ZW/N8, AFA1HE (ex WD6CQV, AFA8JM, AFA1D0)  
AFIT School of Engineering, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH  
Welcome to Ohio: Our state flower is the orange highway construction barrel.  
Help eliminate FOD in our lifetime.

-----

Date: Fri, 30 Apr 93 22:06:50 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <0owP3B2w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us> ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:  
>If you're  
>in contact with a ham who is also a MARS operator and you wish to move the  
>contact over to MARS frequencies, you'll need to come up with something  
>other than that designator to indicate \_which\_ frequency you're moving to.

Just changing designator is not sufficient if the intent is still to encode the "secret" frequency on the air so that others cannot understand the meaning. I would suggest, in this situation, if the MARS ops wish to communicate the frequency, they would need to use an alternative comms service, such as the telephone, to express this.

If you want to communicate on ham radio, you have to use clear text.  
That doesn't mean you cannot arrange with someone to speak in private.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ            | Views expressed here are    \*  
\* (310) 337-5136                | mine and do not necessarily   \*  
\* dana@locus.com    DoD #466       | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Fri, 30 Apr 93 20:46:59 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,  
<1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu>, <1993Apr29.075831@IASTATE.EDU>na  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1993Apr29.075831@IASTATE.EDU> wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J Turner) writes:

>In article <1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu>, brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:  
>> rick@ricksys.lonestar.org (Richard McCombs KB5SNF) writes:  
>> >From what I understand MARS doesn't operate under Amateur, ie Part 97  
>> >regulations, so why would it be a problem for them to obscure the  
>> >meaning?  
>>  
>> Because the discussion Dana relates was taking place not on MARS

>> channels, but on regular amateur frequencies. On THOSE, it's illegal  
>> to use codes to obscure meanings.  
>>  
>> - Brian  
>  
>I've got a question: did he actually use the designators on amateur  
>frequencies? My understanding was that designators were only discussed, not  
>actually used. If they weren't used, then no obscuring of meaning was done.  
>Period.

Yeah, but you seem to have missed the entire point. I wasn't trying to  
turn someone in for breaking the rules. I was pointing out a humorous  
exchange regarding how \*some\* MARS ops interpret the rules. But you seem  
to have entirely missed that so never mind.

>If someone actually said "hey, MARS operator. Let's meet on Charlie Freq" I  
>think it is more difficult to decide, but it may not automatically be obscuring  
>the meaning. Sure, they aren't saying the exact frequency, but then I've heard  
>hams say stuff like "let's go to the DMRAA (for example) repeater." In my mind  
>this is much the same thing. Also, national security should take precedence.  
>If it is the DoD's policy to use designators on the air, then I don't think we  
>can argue too much.

You need to readjust your thinking. If the content of a message is changed  
in order to obscure the meaning, that is the intentional use of a cipher.  
Period. What is so hard to understand about that?

If you use a code to communicate on radio, that is OK, as long as you  
are willing to reveal the meaning of the code \*on the air\* to \*anybody\*  
who asks. In the case of MARS, I was told "We use designators on the air  
so jammers won't know which frequencies we are using". That is obscuring  
the content of a message, plain and simple, and is illegal on amateur  
radio, the DOD notwithstanding.

Anyway, the whole national security argument, is, as usual, a pile of  
crap. The MARS frequencies are \*not\* secret, they are in publicly  
available publications of several types.

Sheesh.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----



Date: 30 Apr 93 17:04:55 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!n4tii@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr26.210644.168445@locus.com>,  
<1993Apr27.215336.18753@kd4nc.uucp>, <1rq67q\$ltk@umcc.umcc.umich.edu>  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

tim@umcc.umcc.umich.edu (Tim Tyler) writes:

>In article <1993Apr27.215336.18753@kd4nc.uucp> n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed)  
writes:

>>

>> \*Sorry, I don't know this editor that well.....anyway...I'm in Air Force  
>>MARS and no we do not discuss radio frequencies on the air. We refer to  
>>all the frequencies in the form of a designator.  
>>The reason why we do this is for national security. And, yes, it is to  
>>obscure the meaning of the transmission...the casual listener does not

>

> Saying "Request you QSY to circuit CHARLIE ALPHA" does not obscure the  
>meaning of the transmission. It just may (or may not) stump some monitors  
>as to what freq matches channel CHARLIE ALPHA.

>>need to know everything MARS does. In the interest of national security,  
>>in time of war or something, if sensitive traffic was being routed thru  
>>MARS, we don't want "Charlie" following us across the band.

> That logic is rather pathetic (but rather typical). 'Sensitive' traffic  
>should be encrypted or encoded. It is stupid to just hope that you're using  
>a frequency that unauthorized stations don't know about.

Not really...most mars traffic is never of a sensitive top secret level anyway.  
It's not likely that MARS stations are going to transmit the launch codes or  
something to the ICBMS.... But, part of the reason for mars is to have a  
backup communications system in case the primary military comms go out. In  
that case, we get used to designators.....but to rethink and restate it all  
out...the designators are also for brevity, too...but it is expressly  
forbidden for us (AFMARS) to give a freq out over the air...and that usually  
has been interpreted to mean ANY FREQ....including a ham freq, another MARS  
service...etc.

> I've used MARS in the past, and agree that they provide a tremendous  
>public service. However, I've met some MARS affiliate operators who --to  
>put it nicely-- overemphasize their national security role, and even go so  
>far as to say that they have access to classified material, such as MARS  
>freqs!

Ahh...there's always that gung-ho guy who thinks that since he's a MARS op, that he's Gen. Powell's right hand man....

> Let's see if I understand this correctly. In some cases, MARS  
>might be transmitting 'sensitive' information over (non-secure) radio  
>circuits, & doesn't want unauthorized stations (SWLs, GRU, etc.) to  
>compromise the data. MARS uses channel designators because they know that  
>unauthorized stations monitor their HF circuits.

> Did I miss something?

> As far as I know, the only thing classified about MARS stations are  
>the locations of stations whose AFMARS callsign suffix starts (or ends, I  
>can't recall) with an X.

> Using channel-designators for BREVITY reasons, on the other hand, makes  
>sense.

Yeah....that's part of the reason for them.... makes life simple to  
just say, "Go to ROMEO DELTA or something"

>>

>>BTW, I'll deny those two freqs you had listed...they're not Air Force MARS.

>>

> Information USAF MARS HQ sent me back when I was a kid indicate that  
>their standard VHF repeater pair is 142.15(input)/143.45(output), &  
>143.95MHz simplex. AFMARS also has access to 49.980MHz.

I will neither confirm nor deny those channels. (grin)

>>John

>>

>>AFA2FH N4TII

All that is still the same. n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

>

>

>--

> Tim Tyler Internet: tim@ais.org MCI Mail: 442-5735 GEnie: T.Tyler5  
>P.O. Box 443 C\$erve: 72571,1005 DDN: Tyler@Dockmaster.ncsc.mil  
>Ypsilanti MI Packet: KA8VIR @WB8ZPN.#SEMI.MI.USA.NA  
>48197

-----

Date: Fri, 30 Apr 93 22:12:49 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,  
<1993Apr28.230959.28832@kd4nc.uucp>, <1rnrup\$ijl@network.ucsd.edu>hard.l  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1rnrup\$ijl@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:  
>Hmmp. Well, Dana, I guess this just goes to show that passing a code  
>test doesn't guarantee the ability to read and understand plain English.  
> - Brian

Well, Brian, I'm starting to think the code test really is a riff-raff  
filter. It isn't a perfect riff-raff filter, it does fail from time to  
time, but it does a pretty good as far as I can tell.

Yeah, the code tests seem to allow only the riff-raff to pass, and keep  
the sensible people out.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: 30 Apr 93 11:42:14 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!  
triangle.cs.uofs.edu!bill@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930427.185749.5j7.rusnews.w165w@ricksys.lonestar.org>,  
<1rmbvq\$sgp@network.ucsd.edu>, <1993Apr29.075831@IASTATE.EDU>  
Subject : Re: MARS operators and coded messages (was Re: MARS)

In article <1993Apr29.075831@IASTATE.EDU>, wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J Turner)  
writes:

|>  
|> this is much the same thing. Also, national security should take precedence.  
|> If it is the DoD's policy to use designators on the air, then I don't think we  
|> can argue too much.  
|>

This is really getting ridiculous. MARS has absolutely nothing to do with

national security. The frequencies aren't secret. For very practical reasons they have to be right outside the ham bands (that kind of narrows down where you have to search.) They all use very distinctive callsigns (unlike tactical callsigns which have no meaning and change frequently, but at least every 24 hours.) And lastly, I will dig up my MARS manual this weekend and quote the applicable part that specifically states that MARS operators are also not allowed to use encryption. Frequency designators are not encryption and are not intended to obscure the information. Their real purpose is to ensure understanding. Which do you think is easier to understand under noisy conditions (using either voice or CW): "Change to frequency Alpha Bravo" or "Change to frequency one four four seven three point nine kilohertz"? Of course, if the intended purpose of using the designator on a HAM frequency was obfuscation, then, by intent, it was illegal.

My experience was with Army MARS. Would someone from Air Force and Navy/Marine Corp MARS care to look up and post the exact paragraph regarding use of encryption by MARS operators??

bill KB3YV

--  
Bill Gunshannon | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco  
bill@cs.uofs.edu | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."  
University of Scranton |  
Scranton, Pennsylvania | #include <std disclaimer.h>

-----  
Date: Thu, 29 Apr 93 20:55:44 GMT  
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <27APR199306472589@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,  
<1993Apr27.185354.4329@nnntp2.cxo.dec.com>,  
<930428.005354.5C3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>  
Subject : Re: no-code defense

In article <930428.005354.5C3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com  
(Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

>  
>But... you must have passed at least 1A to get on CW on any portions of  
>the HF bands. Simple as that. I will say one thing, I enjoy the bottom  
>25 kc's of the bands because it's not as congested. If we start fucking  
>with the code requirements, it's gonna be a free-for-all down there and  
>that's not something I want, having worked to gain an Extra class  
>ticket.  
>

>And btw, if you happen to be a no-code and are offended by my  
>attitude... well there are two words for you....  
>  
>...- ...- ...- ...- ...-

Ohhhh, Tony... you're so witty.

I have an Extra class license, too. I have yet to hear a rational argument in favor of keeping the current CW requirements. I've heard a lot of huffing, puffing and emotional rambling, but I have yet to hear why knowing 20WPM makes an Extra more valuable to the US Amateur Service.

Obviously, knowing 20WPM CW hasn't kept you from being a foul-mouthed blow-hard.

I've followed this thread up on rec.radio.amateur.policy. Please, if making any further followups to this inane and pointless thread, use rec.radio.amateur.policy.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #122

\*\*\*\*\*